

## REMARKS

### Entry of Amendment

As Applicants are filing a RCE herewith, this amendment (and the prior Response (F) filed July 11, 2011) should be entered and considered by the Examiner at this time.

### Claim Rejections – 35 USC 102/103

In the Final Rejection (and apparently maintained in the Advisory Action), the Examiner continues to reject Claims 1-3 and 7-16 under 35 USC §102(b) as anticipated, or in the alternative, under 35 USC §103(a) as obvious over Kido (Kido et al. (US 2003/0189401)). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

While Applicants traverse this rejection, in order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicants are amending independent Claims 1 and 17 to recite the feature of “wherein the mixed layer included in one of the plurality of light emitting units is in direct contact with the first electrode” (anode in Claim 17). This feature is supported by, for example, Fig. 1 of the present application.

In contrast, in the rejection, the Examiner states that Fig. 41 in Kido shows there are a mixed layer 4-1 (charge generation layer) between electrode 2 and light emitting layers 3-2. However, the “mixed layer 4-1” is not in direct contact with electrode 2. Therefore, amended Claims 1 and 17 are not disclosed or suggested by Kido.

Applicants note that independent Claims 18 and 19 already recite the feature of wherein the first mixed layer is in direct contact with the electrode (anode). As explained above, clearly Kido does not disclose a mixed layer (which the Examiner contended above was the charge generation layer 4-1, 4-2, etc. in Figs. 41 and 8) in direct contact with an electrode (only the light emissive

layers which the Examiner alleges corresponds to the claimed light emitting layer are in direct contact with the electrodes).

In addition, it appears that the Examiner is ignoring the plain meaning of the claims and incorporating features and importing limitations from the specification into the claims. This is improper.

Further, in the rejection, the Examiner contends that Kido discloses thin layers of organic and inorganic/organic layers adjacent the electrodes where one of the layers is in direct contact with an electrode. However, the Examiner does not say where this is shown in Kido. This is also improper.

Therefore, independent Claims 1 and 17-19 are not disclosed or suggested by Kido, and Claims 1, 17-19 and those claims dependent thereon are patentable over Kido. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

#### Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and should be allowed.

If any further fee should be due for this amendment, the RCE, and/or the extension of time, please charge our deposit account 23-0920.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Date: August 11, 2011

Respectfully submitted,

/Mark J. Murphy/

Mark J. Murphy

Registration No. 34,225

Husch Blackwell LLP  
120 South Riverside Plaza  
Chicago, Illinois 60606  
(312) 526-1533

Customer No. 24628